

and \$4 million in outlays below the 302(b) allocation. The bill provides \$155 million or .8 percent more in discretionary budget authority and \$1.0 billion or 5.6 percent more in discretionary outlays than last year's bill. The bill provides \$72 million more in discretionary budget authority and \$93 million more in discretionary outlays than the President's budget request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be inserted in the RECORD. I urge the adoption of the bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1391, INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 2004—SPENDING  
COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2004, \$ millions]

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget authority .....	19,627	64	19,691
Outlays .....	19,359	70	19,429
Senate Committee allocation:			
Budget authority .....	19,627	64	19,691
Outlays .....	19,363	70	19,433
2003 level:			
Budget authority .....	19,472	64	19,536
Outlays .....	18,340	73	18,413
President's request:			
Budget authority .....	19,555	64	19,619
Outlays .....	19,266	70	19,336
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority .....	19,627	64	19,691
Outlays .....	19,393	70	19,463
Senate Reported bill compared to:			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority .....			
Outlays .....	(4)		(4)
2003 level:			
Budget authority .....	155		155
Outlays .....	1,019	(3)	1,016
President's request:			
Budget authority .....	72		72
Outlays .....	93		93
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority .....			
Outlays .....	(34)		(34)

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. BURNS. I ask unanimous consent that the Interior appropriations bill move to third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BURNS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the passage of the bill, as amended.

The bill (H.R. 2691), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DORGAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Again, I thank my good friend from North Dakota. We worked very closely on this bill. I think we set a record. Actually, we started last Thursday and everyone shuffled out of

town for some reason or other—Isabel or something. But we actually have only worked on this bill—this is Tuesday—we did not have votes yesterday and we got some work done.

I appreciate the Senator's contribution to this bill. His staff has been very good.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on the amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. TALENT) appointed Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. REID, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. MIKULSKI conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IRAQ

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday we had a hearing in the Senate Appropriations Committee with Ambassador Bremer, who has just returned from Iraq and is here for the week to talk about the needs in the country of Iraq, especially to talk about the requested \$87 billion that is the part of the President's request he says is necessary for both the military needs in Iraq, to support the troops stationed in Iraq and now completing their mission in Iraq, and also \$20 billion for the reconstruction of Iraq. I want to make a couple of comments about that because, since our hearing yesterday, I have been doing some research.

At the hearing yesterday I said to the Ambassador: It is quite clear to me the Congress will respond affirmatively. First of all, it is unthinkable to send America's sons and daughters wearing our military uniform to war anywhere in the world and not provide all the support that is necessary and that is requested. The military portion of that request, in my judgment, will be granted, should be granted completely and quickly.

Second, on the question of reconstructing Iraq, the \$20 billion necessary for the reconstruction of this country,

I asked Ambassador Bremer a number of questions. I want to make a comment about that and some of the research I have done since that time.

It is the case that the campaign that was called "Shock and Awe," which we all saw on the television, of bombing and the ensuing military action with smart bombs, smart weapons—that campaign did not target Iraq's infrastructure. It did not target the electric facilities, did not target the power facilities or dams or roads or bridges. It targeted military targets, palaces, and other items of strategic value, but it specifically did not target infrastructure in Iraq. So the damage to the infrastructure in Iraq is not damage caused by America's military action in Iraq. It is caused now, increasingly, by the insurgent movement in Iraq, the terrorists and others who are engaged in destruction in Iraq.

But the question I was asking the Ambassador about reconstructing Iraq is, If we did not destroy Iraq's infrastructure, then why should the American taxpayer be paying money to reconstruct the infrastructure? I suggested the infrastructure obviously needs to be dealt with, but should not the oil reserves in Iraq be used to pump the oil and produce the revenue for the reconstruction of this country? Iraq has the second largest oil reserves in the world. Those oil reserves, it seems to me, ought to be used for the reconstruction of Iraq. Let Iraqi oil pay for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Ambassador Bremer said to me: One of the problems with that approach is Iraq has a substantial amount of accumulated debt.

Since yesterday I began to research what is this debt that Iraq owes the rest of the world. My guess is it is the Saddam Hussein government that owes the rest of the world. That government does not exist. He is in hiding somewhere. The government doesn't exist any longer.

Here are the countries that Saddam Hussein presumably owes money to: Kuwait, probably somewhere around \$20 billion; Saudi Arabia, \$25 billion; the other gulf states, probably \$25 billion; Russia, \$10 billion; France, \$6 billion. These are not specific amounts that are tied down very well because the World Bank Debtor Reporter System tells us there are no collated figures available from Iraq because Iraq is one of the few countries which did not report its debt statistics.

So no documents exist in the Iraqi Ministry of Finance. None of it has yet emerged. They may well have been lost in the chaos. But would it be ironic if the American taxpayer is told that they must use their money to reconstruct Iraq and the Iraqi oil wells will pump oil, the proceeds of which will be used to pay Saudi Arabia and Kuwait for debts incurred while Saddam Hussein ran the Iraqi Government? You talk about a Byzantine result, that is it.

I believe reconstruction is necessary. But I also believe that reconstruction